Case 2:23-cv-01577-RFB-MDC Document 32 Filed 03/08/24 Page 1 of 5

Pursuant to LR IA 6-1, Plaintiff David Terezo and Defendant MGM Resorts International ("MGM") (collectively, the "Parties") respectfully stipulate MGM's time to respond to the Complaint be extended from the current deadline of March 11, 2024 to and including April 10, 2024. This is the fourth stipulation for an extension of time to file MGM's responsive pleading. The court previously granted an extension on January 16, 2024. ECF No. 27.

Good cause exists to enlarge the time for MGM to respond to the Complaint. There are currently thirteen other related actions filed against MGM pending in this District (the "Related Actions"). See Owens v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-01480; Kirwan v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-01481; Zussman v. VICI Properties 1 LLC, et al., No. 2:23-cv-01537; Lackey v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-01549; Pircio v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-01550; Rundell v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-01698; Bezak v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-01719; Albrigo v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-1981; Zari v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-01826; Sloan v. Vici Properties Inc., et al., No. 2:23-cv-02042; Righetti v. MGM Resorts Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-0164; Mejia v. MGM Resorts, Int'l, No. 2:23-cv-00081.

On December 6 and December 20, 2023, plaintiffs' counsel in six consolidated putative class actions brought against MGM by individuals who allege their PII was compromised as a result of a cybersecurity incident involving MGM in 2019 (the "2019 Actions") filed Notices of Related Cases Pursuant to District of Nevada Local Rule 42.1, notifying the Court that the Related Actions are related to the 2019 Actions. *In re: MGM Resorts Int'l Data Breach Litig.*, No. 2:20-CV-00376-GMN-NJK, ECF Nos. 186, 188. Plaintiffs in those actions have opposed this effort because the 2019 Actions involved a different threat actor and different data. No order has issued on the notices filed by the plaintiffs in the 2019 Actions, and MGM has not responded to any other Complaint in the Related Actions.

The parties in the Related Actions are discussing this development in addition to the consolidation of the Related Actions. The parties in the Related Actions have also engaged

| 1  | in preliminary information exchange that may avoid the need for certain motion practice      |   |
|----|--|---|
| 2  | which would conserve judicial resources. As such, additional time is required to permit time |   |
| 3  | to meet and confer with the various parties to the Related Actions.                          |   |
| 4  | The Parties' request is made in good faith to enable the parties to finalize the join        |   |
| 5  | motion for consolidation and conserve judicial and party resources. Moreover, this case is   |   |
| 6  | in its infancy, and this request will not prejudice any party.                               |   |
| 7  | WHEREAS the Parties respectfully request that MGM shall have until April 10                  |   |
| 8  | 2024, to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint.                                |   |
| 9  | Dated: March 7, 2024   | Respectfully submitted,                                     |
| 10 |  | By: /s/ Leon Greenberg                                      |
| 11 |  | LEON GREENBERG  LEON GREENBERG PC                           |
|    |  | State Bar Number: 8094                                      |
| 12 |  | 1811 South Rainbow Boulevard # 210                          |
| 13 |  | Las Vegas, Nevada 89146                                     |
|    |  | ranni@overtimelaw.com                                       |
| 14 |  | RACHELE R. BYRD (pro hac vice)                              |
| 15 |  | WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER                                      |
| 16 |  | FREEMAN & HERZ LLP  |
| 10 |  | 750 B Street, Suite 1820                                    |
| 17 |  | San Diego, CA 92101   |
| 18 |  | byrd@whafh.com  |
|    |  | JON TOSTRUD (pro hac vice)                                  |
| 19 |  | ANTHONY CARTER (pro hac vice)                               |
| 20 |  | TOSTRUD LAW GROUP, PC                                       |
| 21 |  | 1925 Century Park East, Suite 2100<br>Los Angeles, CA 90067 |
| 21 |  | jtostrud@tostrudlaw.com                                     |
| 22 |  | acarter@tostrudlaw.com                                      |
| 23 |  | ERIK LANGELAND (pro hac vice)                               |
| 24 |  | ERIK H. LANGELAND, P.C.                                     |
| 25 |  | 733 Third Avenue, 16th Floor<br>New York, N.Y. 10017        |
| 26 |  | elangeland@langelandlaw.com                                 |
| 27 |  | Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class              |
| 28 |  | and   |
|    |  |   |

By: <u>/s/ Todd L. Bice</u> Todd L. Bice PISANELLI BICE, PLLC 400 S. 7th Street Suite 300 Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: 702.214.2100 tlb@pisanellibice.com Angela C. Agrusa (pro hac vice) **DLA PIPER LLP (US)**2000 Avenue of the Stars Suite 400 North Tower Los Angeles, CA 90067-4735 Angela.agrusa@us.dlapiper.com Attorneys for Defendant MGM Resorts International 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 2 3 DAVID TEREZO, individually and on behalf of Case No. 2:23-cv-01577-JAD-MDC all others similarly situated, 4 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING Plaintiff, **STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME** 5 TO FILE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT v. 6 MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL, 7 Defendant. 8 9 10 Upon consideration of the foregoing stipulation to extend Defendant MGM Resorts 11 International's time to file response to Plaintiff's Complaint in the above-captioned action, 12 it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Stipulation is **GRANTED**, and the time for MGM Resorts 13 International to answer, move, or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint is hereby 14 extended to and including April 10, 2024. 15 16 IT IS SO ORDERED: 17 18 MAXIMILIANO D. COUVILLIER III 19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 20 DATED: March 8, 2024 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28